



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,132	02/13/2001	Hisatake Okamura	36856.404	9836

7590 10/07/2002

Keating & Bennett LLP
Suite 312
10400 Eaton Place
Fairfax, VA 22030

EXAMINER

JONES, STEPHEN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2817

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/782,132	Applicant(s) OKAMURA ET AL. <i>PL</i>
Examiner Stephen E. Jones	Art Unit 2817	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2002 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5, 11 and 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10 and 12-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species I (Figs. 1-3, 5-9, 10A, and 12) in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.

Applicant indicated that claims 1-4 and 6-16 read on the elected species.

However, it appears that Claim 11 more appropriately reads on a different embodiment.

2. Accordingly Claims 5, 11, and 17-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 7.

Drawings

3. Figures 48, 49, and 50 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 7, it is not clear how the ground electrode can be on the "first" main surface when the "metallic film" is recited in claim 1 as being on the "first main surface".

Regarding Claim 15, the phrase "the resonance modes are approximately equal to each other" is not clear as to what particular characteristic(s) of the modes are equal (i.e. what feature or aspect of the two modes is equal). Due to the indefinite nature of the claim, no art rejection has been applied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 14, and 16 (insofar as Claim 7 could be understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Takahashi et al.

Takahashi et al. (Figs. 3C, 3B, and 5) discloses a dual mode resonator including: a dual mode electrode can be formed as a microstrip (Fig. 3C) (Claim 6) or a stripline (Fig. 3B) (Claim 7 insofar as could be understood) on a rectangular substrate (Claim 10); Fig. 5 teaches that the electrode can be formed as a rectangular shape having a rectangular open portion in its middle (Claim 12); input/output electrodes couple the long portions of the dual mode electrode (Claims 1-4 and 16); the dual modes are orthogonal (e.g. see Col. 6, lines 57-58) (Claim 8); the two modes have different resonant frequencies (see Col. 19, lines 19-24) (Claim 9); and inherently the mode

characteristics recited in Claim 14 are included in the Takahashi structure, especially since the Takahashi structure is the same as the present invention structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al.

Takahashi et al. teaches a resonator as described above. However, Takahashi et al. does not explicitly teach that the resonator is made of copper.

It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the resonator of copper instead of the generic conductive microstrip/stripline

material in the Takahashi et al. structure, because copper is a well-known conductive material for forming stripline/microstrip resonators.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Matsuo et al. teaches square shaped resonators.

Yabuki et al. teaches dual mode resonators.

Schallner teaches a dual mode resonator having input/outputs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen E. Jones whose telephone number is 703-305-0390. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Pascal can be reached on 703-308-4909. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6251 for regular communications and 703-308-6251 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

SEJ
October 3, 2002



Robert J. Pascal
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center - 2800